REMARKS

Claim 1 requires selectively bypassing the application processor if the application processor fails to respond within a time period. In addition, it diverts signals from the application processor to the baseband processor.

In the cited reference there is no selectively bypassing the application processor. As clearly pointed out in the material cited, the applications processor is always involved, even in the situation where the auxiliary microprocessor, alleged to be the applications processor, has to turn on the microprocessor 122, which is the baseband processor. In no case is the applications processor ever bypassed.

If that were not enough, there is no selective bypassing and there is no select bypassing of the application processors in response to the application processor failing to respond within a time period.

Therefore, reconsideration is requested. On the same basis, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 11 is also requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 23, 2010

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation